



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VERSUS MILITARY TRAINING IN SCHOOLS
AND COLLEGES.

BY GEORGE W. HOSS.

"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

An ideal education demands the perfect development of the whole man, head, heart, body,—uprightness of character and figure, breadth of scholarship and shoulder. In one part of this education, the ancients were wiser than we. *Mens sana in corpore sano* has not been improved upon in all the ages. A complete poise in mental and bodily development is obviously the true ideal, but means must be considered as well as ends. The securing of the full and fine bodily development among the Greeks and Romans, was commendable, but the means and motive censurable. The motive was not health and manliness *per se*, but war, and the means largely the camp and military drill. Under this régime, Greece presented the finest physical specimens known to the world, but mankind, ever swaying in long pendulum-beats, vibrated to the other extreme in the monastic ages. Perversely applying Paul's law of "keeping the body under," they not only neglected but oppressed, even tortured the body as the clog of the spirit. So, for centuries, the body was held as the natural enemy of the soul. Within the last century, the pendulum has begun to swing back again, and, following the usual law, the tendency is to extremes, if not in both ends and means, at least in means.

Men in their haste to ends, are ever in danger of overlooking means, and hence often blindly follow custom without thought or question. So I fear in the case before us. We want physical development, and in our haste to secure it, blindly adopt the militarism of twenty centuries ago. In this we are not wise, and against this I enter my humble but earnest protest. This for various reasons: 1. That was a pagan age. Though uttered centuries before, Greece and Rome had not heard the proclamation, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." 2. This is a Christian age. Christianity, the mightiest factor of civilization, has been injected into the affairs of this world since the days of Pericles and Cæsar; and the dominating characteristic of this new factor is "peace on earth, good will to men." More specifically and potentially, its author said, "My kingdom is not of this world, else my servants would fight". Again, "Put up thy sword"; again, "Love your enemies"; and again, "The son of man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them".

I respectfully submit that these and the general spirit of the Gospel condemn war and all training tending to the same. Yet in the face of this, a Christian age rushes on thoughtlessly or recklessly to the end regardless of the means. In view of this, what is duty, Christian duty? We answer, stop and discern the difference between ends and means, remembering that ends can not sanctify means.

We all seek the end, a wholesome and healthful physical development, but we cannot all accept the means, military training in the schools. Reasons: 1. It is an educational axiom, that what you put into the schools of a nation will appear in the life of that nation. Military training in the schools will give militarism in the nation. 2. And more explicitly, "Train up a child

in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." This is authority and needs no argument. The corollary follows with almost equal certainty; namely, train him up in the way he should not go, and when he is old he is not likely to depart from it. Train the boy through two, four or six years of school life to admire the "pomp and circumstance of war," and in after years he will be ready as a citizen, as a legislator to give his voice or vote for war when the least provocation arises. The boy who has for two, four or six years of school life been killing his fellow-man, in imagination, will be too ready to kill him in fact in after life. These laws are as fixed and unalterable as the laws of human nature. It is the shallowest of sophisms to say, when he is older he will see differently and will change. Grant this and you cut the ground from under the whole system of education, leaving not a solid inch on which to stand. "What then," says the objector, "shall we give up physical education? No; give up the means, militarism, but hold on to the end. Does any educator at the present day need to be told of calisthenics and gymnastics so effective in giving physical development? More, it is gravely questioned whether military training accomplishes the end as well as other means. Says Dr. Seargent, director of the gymnasium in Harvard University, and an acknowledged authority, "In reference to the gracefulness that is thought to characterize young cadets, I can only say that it is not the outcome of drilling and marching. If you would account for their graceful poise, you should see them for one or two hours each day under the dancing master." He adds in substance that the drill does not even prepare for the full work of the soldier, saying, "The great military nations of Europe have their recruits take from three to twelve months' training in *gymnastics* to develop them as *men* before they are required to do the service as soldiers."

Here the whole scheme seems to break down, failing to make soldiers and more signally failing to make *men*, the very thing claimed by the friends of military drill in the schools.

More general:

1. Every educator knows that youth lives largely in the senses and imagination. This true, the display of weapons, the charm of music, the roar of artillery, all impress the senses and fire the imagination, thus throwing a glamour over the anticipated field of battle. Thus unconsciously is awakened a love for the display and excitement of war.

2. Our public schools were established essentially to make citizens, not soldiers, intelligent voters, conscientious jurymen, veracious witnesses.

3. Good men in all departments of life are asking and praying for the suppression of war and the war spirit, hence peace societies, peace conferences and peace legislation looking to arbitration and final disarmament of all Christian nations.

4. America is leading in this noble work; hence let the schools lead America. If this be so in the secular schools, what should it be in the Christian schools established and sustained by the church? Every consideration would say they should lead, yet in the face of this some of them are zealous for military drill. Here is the very climax of inconsistency, the church, the professed follower and representative of him who came to establish peace on earth, yet practising a system that encourages war. Alas,

for human weakness and human inconsistency! Let us specialize. To-day a minister preaches an eloquent sermon on "loving your enemies," "living peaceably with all men," to-morrow he starts for the board meeting of his college. He finds the school is not growing, rather declining. Immediately, he and his coadjutors decide something must be done, something "to draw." At once the happy(?) idea is conceived of establishing a military department. Our minister at once concurs, and to show his faith by his works, makes as eloquent a plea for this agency of war as he did in his sermon for peace. The plea is largely for "drawing," yet this minister would be shocked, offended, if it were proposed to open a dance club or a billiard hall for the purpose of "drawing." Brother, open your eyes and see where you are.

In closing, let us hear what military men have to say of war. Said Napoleon: "War is the business of barbarians." Said Wellington: "Men who have nice notions of religion have no business to be soldiers." Said Sir Charles Napier while in the flush of victory: "Accursed war; may I never see another shot fired." Said fighting Joe Hooker: "No man can be a fighting man and be a good man,—he must have the devil in him. To kill one another, men must have their blood up and then they are just like devils."

Christian brother, will you place these statements along side the teachings of Christ, then ponder, weigh and digest, before you, by word or act, give encouragement to *military training in Schools?* The word has gone forth, and you cannot annul it, and you ought not to oppose it, "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Western School of Elocution and Oratory,
WICHITA, KAN.

P. S.—Since writing the above, I learn that ex-President Harrison has written a letter to *The Century*, recommending military training in the public schools. 1. This is sincerely to be regretted because of the influence of his name. 2. It is proof of what is claimed in this article, namely, that those trained or practised in the arts of war, quickly turn to militarism. Mr. Harrison being a professed follower of the humble and peaceable Nazarene, it is sincerely to be hoped that he may, at some future day, counteract these words by others more in harmony with the nobler sentiment, "peace on earth, good will to men."

H.

PEACE IN EUROPE.

BY PROFESSOR C. A. EGGERT.

A student of history, who endeavors to take a broad view of human events, cannot fail to be struck with a fact that religious people consider to be the overruling providence of God, while philosophers and historians regard it as a natural result of the evolution of the race, namely, that criminal acts so often produce beneficial results. History records no act more criminal than the declaration of war by France against Prussia in 1870. No matter what point of view we may take, whether we believe, with poets like Victor Hugo, that Paris is the sun of civilization, and that a triumph of civilization is not too dearly bought by a bloody war, or whether we look upon war itself as something necessary to perpetuate the man-

hood of a nation, meaning thereby what the Latins expressed in the word "virtus," we are compelled to admit that a public assembly, a Parliament elected on the basis of universal suffrage, such as the legislative assembly of France, when it declared war against a neighboring nation without any assignable cause, committed a crime as great as it can be imagined. The vote for the declaration of war was almost unanimous. Perhaps never in history was there such a unanimity for such a monstrous purpose. Both Germany and France saw their young manhood decimated. The three decisive battles near Metz alone, from the 14th to 18th of August, 1870, caused a loss of 40,847 dead and wounded to the Prussians, and of 32,842 to the French. Subsequently, after the surrender of Bazaine, it was found that the French had buried 25,000 of their men in the graveyards of Metz.

It is horrible to think of these facts, and we can well understand that the French people became sobered when these facts came home to them. They naturally reflected, inquired, studied. They came to the conclusion that they had made a mistake. Then they went to work and soon another France made its appearance. That France saw and felt that Paris had been too long the only thinking and acting part of France; that the French people had been ignorant, because the people of Paris had been considered the guardians and managers of the public interests, and that because Paris, for two hundred years, had received the special care of every French ruler, it had become arrogant and dictatorial to such a degree that the great French nation could no longer afford to be misled by the caprices and ebullition of their brilliant capital. A total and radical change was not possible at once, but the steps taken to secure the enlightenment of the provinces tended in the direction of such a change. The schools were secularized, and greatly improved, the teachers received higher pay, their number was largely increased, and, at the same time, a higher aim was placed before them. The great proportion of illiterates in 1870-71 has greatly decreased, and, as a consequence, the French people outside of Paris are steadily gaining in influence in the National assembly. If to-day a set of adventurers in Paris should call on the representatives of the French people to vote for a war against any nation that wished to live in peace with France, there would be a shout of indignation, and, perhaps, a rigid prosecution, as the only answer. It cannot be denied, though, that the French feel deeply the pangs of wounded vanity inflicted by their defeats.

Hence, any appeal to their patriotism (which is, after all, only the more dignified form of vanity) finds them ready for almost any sacrifice. It is a most remarkable fact, and one that deserves the closest attention from the friends of peace in France, that all the monstrous appropriations for military purposes have been adopted *without discussion*. It is considered a patriotic duty to vote for whatever the minister of war demands, and he who would raise objections, such as are so generally made in the German parliament, would be denounced a traitor to his country. The armaments to which this free republican nation submits without a murmur are relatively greater than those of any other nation; they are even absolutely greater than those of Germany, though this country has millions more inhabitants. It is difficult to believe that such an enormous army, that such unparalleled armaments, that this continuous pushing her supposed enemy, Germany, to similar measures in the vain hope, perhaps, of bankrupting her, has no other motive than the fear that